

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,555	04/30/2001	Keishi Danjo	35.G2791	7015
5514 ELTZD A TRICI	7590 08/10/2007 Z CELLA HADDED & SC	EXAMINER		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			PATEL, ASHOK	
NEW YORK,	NY 10112		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2879	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

				~			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/846,555	DANJO ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
~		Ashok Patel	2879				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	the correspondence addres	is			
WHI( - Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the toric reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS , cause the application to become ABANI	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this commu DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 A	pril 2007.					
2a)⊠	∑ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters	, prosecution as to the me	rits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>5,6,8-10,13-17 and 22-50</u> is/are pend	ing in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>28-34</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠	Claim(s) 35-50 is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>5,6,8-10,13-17 and 22-27</u> is/are reject	ted.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 30 April 2001 is/are: a)	☐ accepted or b)⊠ objected	d to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s)	s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-1	52.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document		9(a)-(d) or (f).				
	<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li></ul>		ication No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ae			
	application from the International Bureau	· (1)		<i>y</i> ~			
* (	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		eived.				
Attachmer	• •	۰, ۲	(DTO 442)				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mary (PTO-413) ail Date				
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Infor 6) Other:	mat Patent Application				

Page 2

Art Unit: 2879

- 1. It is noted that previously withdrawn claims 11, 12 and 18-21 are cancelled from the application and claims 28-34 depend upon cancelled claims 11, 12 and 18-21. Since claims 11, 12 and 18-21 were formerly withdrawn from consideration, the dependent claims 28-34 are simply withdrawn from consideration due to their dependencies on non-elected claims 11, 12 and 18-21. In view of cancellation of claims 11, 12 and 18-21, the scope of claims 28-34 could not be ascertained.
- 2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the first insulating film (as recited in independent claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 22 and 24) must be shown as being disposed on an upper surface of the substrate in an area except for a partial surface area of the upper surface of the substrate must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be

Application/Control Number: 09/846,555

Art Unit: 2879

labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Page 3

- 3. Newly added claims 35-50 are in condition for allowance since these claims are formerly dependent claims, which were allowable over the prior art but were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims.
- 4. As to claims 5, 6, 8-10, 13-17 and 22-27, applicant's arguments with respect to these claims 5, 6, 8-10, 13-17 and 22-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 13-17 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The original disclosure/specification does not provide a support for the limitation "the first insulating film being disposed on an upper surface of the substrate in an area except for a partial surface area of the upper surface of the substrate" as now recited in amended independent claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 22 and 24.

With respect to the upper surface of the substrate, the original disclosure/specification does provide a support for the first insulating film being disposed on the entire upper surface of the substrate. It is clear from drawing Figures that the upper surface of the substrate is entirely covered with the first insulating film, not just partially covered with the first insulating film.

With respect to the amended limitations in independent claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 22 and 24, the Examiner could not find applicant's

statement in applicant's response filed on 04/19/2007 that the original disclosure does provide a support for the amended limitations "the first insulating film being disposed on an upper surface of the substrate in an area except for a partial surface area of the upper surface of the substrate.

The Examiner therefore disregards the newly added limitation in all amended independent claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 22 and 24 and thereby maintains the previous prior art rejection of claims 5, 6, 8-10, 13-17 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Endo et al (USPN 5,189,337).

- 6. If applicants disagrees with the Examiner's position regarding the original disclosure for not providing support for the amended limitations "the first insulating film being disposed on an upper surface of the substrate in an area except for a partial surface area of the upper surface of the substrate" as recited in amended independent claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 22 and 23, then the following rejection applies alternatively as below.
- 7. As to claims 5, 6, 8-10, 13-17 and 22-27, applicant's arguments with respect to these claims 5, 6, 8-10, 13-17 and 22-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 09/846,555

Art Unit: 2879

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 5, 6, 8-10 and 13-17 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (USPN 5189337, of record).

As to claims 5, 6, 8-10 and 13-17 and 22-27, Endo et al disclose a precursor (Figures 1-2) including a substrate (3); and a first insulating film (ultrafine  $SiO_2$  film 6) containing electrically conductive particulate metal oxide ( $SnO_2$ ,  $InO_2$ ,  $Sb_2O_3$ ) particles (col. 3,  $3^{rd}$  paragraph) provided on a surface of the substrate in an area except for a partial surface area of the

surface; and a second insulating film (4) provided on the first insulating film so as to cover the metal oxide, wherein the second insulating film includes a surface.

Applicant's claimed limitations, such as electron source, electron emitting device, supporting frame (in independent claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 22, 23), and getter (in independent claims 22 and 23) are not given patentable weight since these elements are not part of the claimed precursor.

Endo et al differ from applicant's claimed precursor in that the first insulating ultrafine  $\mathrm{SiO}_2$  film of Endo et al's precursor is not provided on an area except for a partial surface area of the upper surface of the substrate.

However, depending upon type of application and suitability of the precursor within an individual environment or individual device in which the precursor is to be used, the configuration of the first insulating film would be modified appropriately. For example, if the precursor were to be used within a pixel of an electron emission device, then one would have modified the first insulating film selectively so as to emit the electrons from a desired specific area of the pixel and not the entire area of the pixel etc.

In light of this, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Endo et al's precursor with appropriate modified, depending upon its application within specific device, so as to emit the electrons in a desired manner.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS**ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-2456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ashok Patel Primary Examiner Art Unit 2879